Chapter 1

Introduction: Demonstratives in discourse

Åshild Næss
University of Oslo

Anna Margetts
Monash University

Yvonne Treis
LLACAN (CNRS, INALCO)

1 Discourse markers and their functions

Over the last decades, there has been extensive discussion in the typological literature of the functions and uses of demonstratives. It is well established that demonstratives are not restricted to referring to items in situational use based on concrete spatial parameters, but that discourse deictic, anaphoric/tracking, and recognitional uses are also common, if not universal, functions of demonstratives (see Himmelmann 1996; 1997; and Diessel 1999 for systematic overviews). Studies have shown that many parameters beyond location and configuration of referents and speech-act participants play a role in demonstrative choice. In particular, directing the addressee's attention towards a target entity and prior knowledge of a referent either through the previous discourse or from the real world have been identified as relevant (see e.g. Burenhult 2003; Dawuda 2009; Diessel 2006; Enfield 2003; Hanks 1990; 1992; 2005; 2009; Küntay & Özyürek 2006; Özyürek 1998). The diachronic development from demonstratives to other types of markers with grammatical and discourse functions has also been extensively discussed (see again Himmelmann 1996; 1997; Diessel 1999).

Åshild Næss, Anna Margetts & Yvonne Treis. 2020. Introduction: Demonstratives in discourse. In Åshild Næss, Anna Margetts & Yvonne Treis (eds.), *Demonstratives in discourse*, 1–20. Berlin: Language Science Press. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4055812

This volume investigates discourse functions of demonstratives, that is, the type of functions demonstratives perform when they develop into discourse markers.[1] The notion of discourse marker is not very clearly defined, and the question thus arises which functions they comprise, how they can be described, and to what extent demonstratives and their functions match this description. In a broad-brush approach, discourse markers can be described as morphemes which deliver a meta-commentary on the discourse and establish and negotiate intersubjectivity. That is to say, discourse markers perform functions like directing attention as a means of establishing and maintaining joint attention, enabling the addressee to track participants through the discourse, indicating which parts of the discourse the speaker seeks to foreground and which are to be taken for granted, but also indicating the interlocutors' epistemic stance towards or evaluation of a particular portion of discourse (Englebretson 2007). Discourse markers communicate information like *hey, I'm starting something new here*, or *you know this already*, or *this is the important bit*, and *here is what I think about this*. They aid interlocutors in managing and navigating the discourse and in positioning themselves with regards to what is being said.

2 Origins of discourse markers: Lexicon vs. grammar

Discourse markers can originate from both lexical and grammatical elements, and as such they inhabit the interfaces between lexicon and discourse, but also between grammar and discourse. On the one hand, studies of discourse markers describe lexical items or phrases which are recruited into discourse functions, such as focus particles like *only*, *even*, *also* (König 1991), markers of discourse cohesion like *yeah-no* (Burridge & Florey 2002), or connectives like *and* (Schiffrin 2006) or *toujours* (Hansen 2006) to name but a few. On the other hand, discourse markers can be drawn from the domain of grammar and originate, for example, from person-based and spatial deictics (Margetts 2015). In some instances the distinction between lexicon vs. grammar as the source domains is blurred, as in the case of discourse markers like *y'know* and *I mean* (Schiffrin 1987), *I'm afraid* (Mazzon 2019), *voici/voilà* (Grenoble & Riley 1996), or Québec French *t'sais* 'you know' (Dostie 2009: 203), which originate from phrases composed of both lexical items and person or spatial deictics.

There are two ways in which discourse is seen as a distinct domain from grammar in much of the linguistic literature. The first is that discourse normally refers

[1] A large number of terms are used in the literature for what we are here calling "discourse markers", e.g. "discourse particles", "pragmatic markers", "pragmatic particles"; see e.g. Degand & Simon-Vandenbergen (2011) and Heine (2013), and references therein.

to stretches of language longer than a sentence, while the traditional domain of grammar is the single sentence. The second is that discourse refers to utterances within a specific context, defined by such aspects as the speech-act participants and the relation between these, and the physical setting of the interaction; whereas grammar is traditionally considered as abstracted away from properties of any specific instance of use of a linguistic unit.

As a consequence, the terms "discourse marker" and "discourse functions" carry the connotation that the elements in question have functions outside and beyond their domain of origin, i.e. beyond their core function (be that lexical or grammatical), and in this sense the terms suggest functions "outside of grammar". This functional distinction is mirrored in the formal properties often ascribed to discourse markers. For many researchers, they are defined by a certain degree of syntactic independence from their environment, i.e. they are not directly part of the grammatical structure or "not fully integrated into the syntactic structure of the utterance" (Dostie 2009: 209; see also e.g. Schiffrin 1987 and Heine 2013, among others).[2]

But the aspects of discourse vs. grammar outlined above also influence what researchers consider to be the primary functions of discourse markers. For example, Fraser (2006) considers discourse markers to be a subclass of the more general notion of pragmatic marker, and he restricts the term "discourse marker" to forms which signal "a relation between the discourse segment which hosts them and the prior discourse segment" (2006: 190), i.e. a purely structuring function in terms of relating parts of discourse to each other. Heine (2013), on the other hand, employs a broader definition which takes the principal function of discourse markers to be "to relate an utterance to the situation of discourse, more specifically to speaker-addressee interaction, speaker attitudes, and/or the organization of texts" (2013: 1211); that is, not only including the relations between parts of the discourse but also between the discourse and the speech act participants, and the knowledge treated as established or shared by them.

The understanding of grammar and discourse as largely distinct moreover presents a challenge for our investigation, as many of the discourse functions

[2]In Dostie's terms, these forms have undergone a process of pragmaticalisation (Dostie 2009: 203). She contrasts this with "non-discursive" uses of the same linguistic items (as in Québec French *t'sais* 'you know' as a discourse marker vs. as a verbal expression), thus underscoring the notion that discourse functions are distinct from "regular" functions of lexical and grammatical items. See also Degand & Simon-Vandenbergen (2011) and chapters in the special issue of *Linguistics* 49 for more discussion of whether the term grammaticalisation is applicable to the development of discourse markers, or whether a separate process of pragmaticalisation should be assumed.

discussed in the contributions to this volume are covered by what has been described as "engagement" in the literature. This term was coined by Evans et al. (2018a: 1) to describe "grammaticalised means for encoding the relative mental directedness of speaker and addressee towards an entity or state of affairs". This suggests that the type of functions which are typically considered discourse functions can, in individual languages, in fact be part of the grammar, and in this sense would not fall under the notion of discourse functions if these are defined as "outside of grammar". In this particular case, it indicates that there are languages where grammar cannot be divorced from the need to situate the sentence in an utterance context which takes into account the relationship between the speaker, the addressee and their respective states of knowledge. Strictly speaking, this should come as no surprise to speakers of Western European languages which have grammaticalised definite articles, since definiteness is a tool for intersubjective coordination, a means used by the speaker to guide the addressee in identifying the correct referent, based on the speaker's assumptions of the addressee's state of knowledge and activation with respect to the referent (cf. Evans et al. 2018a: 117). It does, however, complicate the endeavour of defining a coherent set of discourse functions as separate from grammar.

The aim of this volume is to explore the kinds of functions that demonstratives can have in discourse cross-linguistically, and for this reason we take an inclusive approach to the notion of discourse marker, following authors such as Degand & Simon-Vandenbergen (2011), Heine (2013) and others. This means that we do not assume a strict division between grammar and discourse, and our use of the term "discourse function" includes markers of engagement as described by Evans et al. We employ the term in a broad functional sense to refer to forms which deliver a meta-commentary on the discourse and/or which establish intersubjectivity, independently of whether they are structurally fully integrated in the grammar of the language.

3 Demonstratives in grammar and discourse

The focus of this volume is on the discourse functions of demonstratives and the types of discourse markers which develop from such elements. The class of forms referred to as demonstratives is large and varied, both cross-linguistically and often also within individual languages. Traditional classifications of demonstratives (e.g. Diessel 1999; Dixon 2003) focus especially on the deictic distinctions made in demonstrative systems, and the morphology, syntax and grammaticalisation of demonstrative forms. Apart from exophoric functions, where

demonstratives identify entities in the physical context of the speech situation (and are typically accompanied by pointing gestures), it is well established that they regularly perform endophoric functions, where they refer to entities within the discourse. Such endophoric uses include introducing, identifying and tracking referents across the discourse (see e.g. Himmelmann 1996; Lichtenberk 1996; Dawuda 2009; Margetts 2020). Arguably, then, demonstratives are by their very nature situated at the grammar-discourse interface and predisposed to take on functions in this realm. This is reflected in the discussion by Diessel (2006), who suggests that demonstratives as a class fall outside the lexicon-grammar distinction. He argues that they "must be kept separate from both content words and grammatical markers" and "constitute a unique class of linguistic expressions serving one of the most fundamental functions in language: In their basic use, they serve to coordinate the interlocutors' joint focus of attention" (Diessel 2006: 464). Focus of attention is where the exophoric and endophoric uses of demonstratives meet, in the sense that both functions involve directing the addressee in identifying a referent as the one the speaker has in mind. From this perspective, the question of whether discourse functions can be separated from grammar may be largely irrelevant for demonstratives, because by definition they incorporate aspects of both.

If demonstratives bridge the lexicon-grammar distinction and are predisposed to take on discourse functions, this raises the question of whether these properties have an impact on the types of markers they develop into, and whether they differ from discourse markers derived from other sources. One possible difference is that demonstratives which take on discourse functions more commonly remain constrained by their sentence-grammatical functions. This is in contrast to the approaches cited above which suggest that discourse markers are generally freed from the syntactic constraints of the source elements. Across the contributions to this volume, demonstratives are commonly described as retaining aspects of their grammatical constraints. Adnominal demonstratives as discourse markers commonly still occur in noun phrases, manner demonstratives retain the distributional properties associated with their deictic use, etc. Indeed this is one of the key points made by Nikitina & Treis (chapter 3): the distributional properties of the original items constrain the types of semantic-pragmatic extensions they may undergo. A similar point is made by Ridge (chapter 4) for the Oceanic language Vatlongos and by Teptiuk (chapter 11) for a number of Finno-Ugric languages, as well as from a more general typological perspective by Diessel & Breunesse (chapter 12). As we discuss in §4, this does not, however, mean that demonstratives *cannot* expand their syntactic scope as they take on discourse functions.

4 Overview of discourse functions discussed in this volume

The contributions to this volume touch on a wide range of different discourse-related functions. The functions addressed and the structure of the discussion in each chapter is determined by the features of the language and by the authors' focus, rather than by a framework dictated across the volume. In this section we present an overview of certain discourse functions which emerged as common threads across several chapters, however it constitutes by no means an exhaustive listing of functions addressed across the individual languages.

Degand & Simon-Vandenbergen (2011) suggest that discourse markers can be arranged on a scale spanning from strictly relational at one end, to non-relational at the other end. Relational discourse markers indicate relations between discourse segments, while non-relational forms are "primarily subjective and intersubjective markers, with little or no linking function" (Degand & Simon-Vandenbergen 2011: 289). Arguably, these two scalar poles relate to the two aspects or notions of discourse described in §1 (which distinguish it from "grammar" in the traditional sense): (a) discourse as comprising stretches of multiple sentences, and (b) discourse as referring to utterances in a context defined by speech-act participants and the relations between them.

Relational functions of discourse markers therefore can be thought to relate to discourse as comprising stretches of multiple sentences which need to be linked to or separated from each other in some fashion. By contrast, the non-relational, intersubjective function arises from discourse as referring to utterances in a specific context, which is defined by the speech-act participants and their relations and interactions. Below, we start from this distinction in order to discuss the main types of discourse functions discussed in this volume, and the relationships between them.

In §4.1 we summarise some of the functions relating to marking text structure and cohesion. §4.2 addresses discourse functions around engagement and intersubjectivity, and in §4.3 we consider emotional deixis and affect. In §4.4 we review the non-deictic members of demonstrative paradigms and the types of functions they express. However, it should be noted that in many cases discourse markers combine functions from more than one of these domains and the sections are a convenient means of structuring our discussion rather than clear categorical distinctions.

4.1 Text-structure and cohesion

In this section we address a number of functions which provide meta-information on the structure of the discourse. We subsume here, for example, tracking of referents throughout the discourse, but also indicating which stretches of discourse belong together or form separate thematic groupings. Most of these functions are located towards the relational end of Degand & Simon-Vandenbergen's scale, but they can also bridge between relational and non-relational functions. This is the case, for example, when markers perform text-structuring and intersubjective functions at the same time (such as highlighting stretches of discourse as forming a unit and at the same time evaluating them as important or unexpected).

Functions related to reference tracking and reference shift are strongly relational in that they indicate the relationship between a current referential expression and a preceding (or following) one. They indicate whether expressions have the same referent or whether the referent has changed. Such functions are the focus of the studies by Fuchs & Schumacher (chapter 8) and by Nahkola et al. (chapter 10). Fuchs & Schumacher study what they call the referential shift potential of two types of demonstrative pronouns in German, i.e. to what extent they are used to change the referential structure of a narrative by highlighting a previously less prominent referent in the ongoing discourse. Nahkola et al. look at how demonstrative adverbs are used in the description and comparison of locations in an experimental setting in Russian, Estonian and Finnish. They find that in all three languages, the proximal demonstrative adverbs occur mostly in first mentions of the referential chain, whereas the distal ones occur when the referent is already activated. However, in Finnish, activated referents are more commonly indicated with the addressee-centred demonstrative. Finnish uses demonstrative pronouns more often for first mentions and precise identification of referents, whereas Russian uses bare noun phrases more in such cases. Reference tracking is also described as a function of the Vatlongos demonstrative *ak* (Ridge, chapter 4), of Kalamang *opa* (Visser, chapter 5), and of several demonstrative forms in Pilagá (Payne & Vidal, chapter 7). Two of the chapters also address the preferences of demonstrative forms for anaphoric vs. cataphoric uses. In Vatlongos (Ridge), it is the proximal demonstrative which is used anaphorically, and in fact the other members of the three-term deictic paradigm do not show extensions into discourse functions at all. In the Permic language Udmurt, demonstratives in quotative indexes most frequently show an anaphoric function for the distal form and a cataphoric function for the proximal form (Teptiuk, chapter 11). This confirms suggestions in the literature (König, chapter 2; König 2012: 26–27) that distal (or: non-proximal) forms are more likely to have anaphoric functions

whereas proximal forms are more likely to be cataphoric, at least when referring to stretches of discourse as in English *I can't believe he said* ***that*** vs. *I'll tell you* ***this****: it's going to be tough.*

The use of demonstratives as discourse-connective devices is similarly relational in that they indicate an explicit link between the preceding and the following part of the discourse. Clause-connecting uses are the focus of the chapters by König (chapter 2), Diessel & Breunesse (chapter 12), and Teptiuk (chapter 11). König considers the use of demonstratives as connectives expressing rhetorical relations (English *so*, *hereby*). Diessel & Breunesse analyse eight types of clause linkers that are frequently derived from demonstratives cross-linguistically: relative pronouns, linking and nominalising articles, quotative markers, complementisers, conjunctive adverbs, adverbial subordinate conjunctions, correlatives and topic markers. Teptiuk looks at how manner demonstratives are used in quotative indexes, i.e. to introduce a direct or indirect quote, in computer-mediated communication in five Finno-Ugric languages: Finnish, Estonian, Hungarian, Udmurt, and Komi. These languages differ in the number of manner deictics and the contrasts made in the system, as well as in terms of which of the forms are found in quotative indexes. The patterns of use in quotative indexes are shown to depend on how the manner demonstratives are used in non-quotative contexts. A clause-connecting function is also found with the Kambaata manner demonstratives *hittigúta* and *híttíkk* (Nikitina & Treis, chapter 3) and the Pilagá classifier *da?* and demonstrative root *m?e* (Payne & Vidal, chapter 7).

Also relating to discourse structuring properties in a broad sense are the functions around discourse repair reported for Vatlongos (Ridge, chapter 4), where the speaker-proximal demonstrative is used to mark a constituent which follows after a hesitation. In another repair-related function, the contrastive demonstrative is used to modify lexical placeholders ("that thing") which are used instead of more specific formulations.

The use of demonstratives to foreground or background particular stretches of discourse (or participants) can still be considered relational in that it pertains to the relationship between different portions of discourse. This is particularly clear in the use of the speaker-proximal demonstrative in the so-called tail-head linkage construction in Vatlongos (Ridge, chapter 4), where a situation or referent that is introduced as new information at the end of one section is repeated as given information at the beginning of the next section of discourse. The repeated information thus serves as background to which further new information can be added. In Vatlongos, the speaker-proximal demonstrative is often used in the repeated sections, with the second, backgrounded mention or a referent. This

holds especially for referents that remain prominent in the subsequent discourse and in this way the demonstrative also carries evaluative meaning.

Backgrounding functions are also not strictly referential: They introduce a link between the discourse and the speech situation in that backgrounding again involves the speaker's subjective evaluation of which aspects of the discourse are to be emphasised or de-emphasised. This is particularly clear with functions explicitly described as evaluative, i.e. as indicating some form of commentary on the narrative by the speaker, or as marking the noteworthiness or expectedness of a particular stretch of discourse. Bliss & Wiltschko (chapter 6) discuss such a function for Blackfoot, where noteworthiness is indicated by proximate, as opposed to obviative, inflection on the demonstrative. Nikitina & Treis (chapter 3) also mention evaluation as a function of the extraposition construction with manner demonstratives in Wan. In Blackfoot, the distinction between speaker-proximal and addressee-proximal forms can indicate the expectedness or unexpectedness of the content of a proposition, which also relates to foregrounding and backgrounding functions in the sense that particular aspects of the discourse are being highlighted. The Blackfoot speaker-proximal form can mark a proposition as expected, predictable, or familiar to the addressee, while the addressee-proximal form is used when the content is unexpected, surprising, or new to the addressee. These can be considered as both relational and nonrelational functions. The demonstratives contribute to text coherence, but again also encode evaluation and stance in the sense that not just the proposition itself, but the speaker's assessment of it (as being predictable or surprising) is categorized. Similarly, in Pilagá, the 'unseen' demonstrative can be used as a marker of the speaker's uncertainty (Payne & Vidal, chapter 7). The classifiers which combine with the demonstrative roots into complex determiners can have modal uses in Pilagá, with the 'unseen, absent' classifier indicating the ignorance, desires or intentions of the speaker rather than a realised event. These functions also relate to the expressions of affect and emotional deixis which we address in §4.3.

The function of managing turn-taking, by indicating whether a particular utterance should be taken to open a new turn or to close an ongoing turn, is less linked to internal discourse coherence and more to managing the speech situation and the interaction between interlocutors. Such functions are discussed in this volume by König (chapter 2), who looks at the idiomatic use of demonstratives as discourse-structuring devices. These can be divided into those which are primarily used in introductory, initiating conversational moves (English *Now then!*, *Here you are!*) and those which are primarily used in responsive, conclusive conversational moves (*So there!*, *That's that.*).

4.2 Engagement and intersubjectivity

A number of the chapters discuss demonstratives with a recognitional function, which mark a referent as being identifiable on the basis of shared knowledge between speaker and addressee (Himmelmann 1996). Typically, in a recognitional use, "the speaker is uncertain whether or not the kind of information he or she is giving is shared by the addressee or whether or not this information will be sufficient in allowing the addressee to identify the intended referent" (Himmelmann 1996: 230). Establishing that the Kalamang form *opa* is basically a recognitional demonstrative is the main focus of Visser's contribution (chapter 5). Interestingly, in Kalamang, the recognitional use extends to exophoric situations ('there's that person whom we both know'), whereas previous studies (e.g. Diessel 1999) have considered the recognitional function as a subtype of endophoric demonstrative use.

Recognitional functions are also discussed for Vatlongos, where it is the proximal demonstrative that appears in this use (Ridge, chapter 4), for Pilagá, which has a dedicated recognitional demonstrative root (Payne & Vidal, chapter 7), and for Norwegian, where the third person singular pronouns *han/hun* as demonstratives can have a recognitional function (Johannessen, chapter 9).

The recognitional function typically pertains to the identification of a nominal referent, and so is linked to adnominal demonstratives. As discussed above, demonstratives commonly retain varying aspects of their grammatical constraints and functions when they develop into discourse markers and so adnominal demonstratives typically remain adnominal when their usage is extended, and they take on functions scoping over the noun phrase in which they appear. However, changes in scope are also attested, and scope extensions from single words or phrases to entire clauses are commonly described (see e.g. the contributions to Bril 2010 and Margetts 2016; 2019; 2020). An interesting case of scope change is discussed by Bliss & Wiltschko for the Blackfoot "untranslatable demonstratives" (chapter 6). These forms have undergone a shift in scope in the direction towards greater syntactic independence – which is considered characteristic of discourse markers by many researchers, as discussed in §1: They no longer take a nominal complement and are frequently clause-initial. In parallel to this structural change, functionally they scope over the whole proposition, marking distinctions of epistemicity, such as whether the event described is considered to be expected or surprising in the context of the unfolding discourse. Bliss & Wiltschko describe these functions as recognitional use, in parallel to the use of adnominal demonstratives as marking that the intended referent has to be identified via specific but presumably shared knowledge (Himmelmann 1996: 207). However, the Blackfoot

forms in this particular usage differ from the canonical recognitional function in that they do not pertain to the identification of a referent, but to the degree of predictability of an event. If we make explicit the distinction between demonstratives that scope over referents and those that scope over propositions, we can thus understand the function of the untranslatable Blackfoot demonstratives as being similar, but not identical, to the canonical recognitional use. While the latter pertains to knowledge about a referent, the Blackfoot demonstratives function to manage intersubjective knowledge about events in the discourse. In their discussion of engagement, Evans et al. (2018a: 134) note that "[t]here are some important differences between engagement as it can apply to objects (especially objects that are present in the speech situation) and as it applies to events and situations". The Blackfoot data shows that demonstratives are not only able to encode object-related engagement, but also the event and situation-related type.[3]

4.3 Emotional deixis and affect

The idea that demonstratives can indicate "emotional deixis", invoking a sense of solidarity and shared emotional involvement, goes back to Lakoff (1974). We are not aware of any systematic cross-linguistic studies of this use of demonstratives, although Šimík (2016) cites work on Czech, German and Japanese as well as English. Potts & Schwarz (2010) link the emotional deictic function of demonstratives to their spatial-deictic function, and suggest that "affective uses of *this* arise from its more basic meaning as a marker of spatio-temporal proximity … If this is correct, then we expect affectivity for proximal demonstratives quite generally across languages" (Potts & Schwarz 2010: 25).

The extension of spatial deictics to affective meaning and to coding referents one feels positively about as 'close', and those one feels negatively about as 'far' is attested in a range of language (see e.g. Farr & Whitehead 1981 and Pryor 1990: 19 on the Papuan languages Korafe and Botin). Interestingly, however, there are three languages in this volume with demonstrative uses which could be described as emotional deixis – Pilagá, Vatlongos, and Norwegian – and in two of them the relevant forms do not in fact encode a deictic value.[4] This perhaps suggests that the emotional use of demonstratives is not exclusively linked to deixis and

[3] This possibility is not explicitly discussed by Evans et al., though they do note that one item in the evidential paradigm of the Papuan language Foe might be related to a distal demonstrative (Evans et al. 2018b: 11).

[4] The Blackfoot "untranslatable" demonstratives can also have an emotive function, but this is achieved through lengthening of the vowel of the demonstrative rather than by the demonstrative in and of itself (Bliss & Wiltschko, chapter 6: §4.4).

distance but also to the inherently intersubjective function of demonstratives as seeking to establish a common ground between speaker and addressee, as suggested by Acton & Potts (2014).

Of the three mentioned languages, only in Pilagá, the 'near' vs. 'far' deictic classifiers encode emotivity in a way that can be linked to their spatial-deictic function: Characters with which the narrator sympathises take the 'near' form, whereas those who are not deserving of sympathy take the 'far' form (Payne & Vidal, chapter 7: §3). In Vatlongos, however, it is the non-deictic contrastive demonstratives in *-e* which take on the function of negative affect, being linked to enemies and troublemakers and to times of fear and distress (Ridge, chapter 5: §4.3).

In Norwegian, the forms analysed by Johannessen (chapter 9) as "psychologically distal" demonstratives are in fact third person pronouns used as adnominal demonstratives, and, again, they do not in themselves encode deictic values (although they can be combined with demonstrative adverbs, as in *han fyren der* 'that guy there'). As Johannessen shows, in constructions without the adverb, i.e. where no deictic contrast is being made, the pronoun typically indicates the speaker's negative attitude to the referent.

It is worth noting that the Norwegian construction in question also has recognitional uses, i.e. it is used to draw attention to shared knowledge between the speaker and addressee. In Vatlongos, on the other hand, the contrastive demonstratives in *-e* do not occur with a recognitional function (though the proximal demonstrative in *=ak* does), and so its extension to marking negative affect must be explained by some other means – presumably as being rooted in the contrastive function itself. Ridge states that the Vatlongos contrastive demonstrative is "closely linked to the breaking of social conventions, especially taboos and concepts of respect and obedience", and perhaps this arises from the notion of contrast as indicating that something is different or diverges from norms or expectations. It is clear that there is considerable potential for further exploration of this aspect of demonstrative use from a cross-linguistic perspective.

4.4 Non-deictic demonstratives

Demonstrative systems are generally defined and described in terms of distance distinctions, either degrees of distance from the speaker or other deictic centre (so-called distance-based systems) or proximity vs. distance to the speaker and/or the addressee in the speech situation (person-based systems). However, demonstrative systems quite commonly include forms which do not encode deictic contrast, but which can nevertheless be analysed as demonstratives, because

they are in a paradigm with forms that do distinguish deictic contrasts. We are not primarily referring here to demonstratives which are spatially neutral or unmarked, as discussed by Levinson (2018), nor to demonstratives which *in addition to* deictic oppositions also express further functions. Our focus here is on items which have a specialised meaning and which does not involve spatial reference. Commonly such non-deictic members of demonstrative paradigms are dedicated to functions like anaphora or contrast, which are commonly attested as additional functions of deictic demonstratives cross-linguistically. An example is the well-documented Latin demonstrative paradigm, which includes a dedicated anaphoric form. We are not aware of any systematic cross-linguistic studies of such non-deictic members of demonstrative paradigm but the languages represented in this volume suggest that they are fairly common.

Systems contrasting a proximal, a distal and an 'unseen' demonstrative, as described for Pilagá (Payne & Vidal, chapter 7), are relatively common in Native American languages (Diessel 1999: 41–42). As far as dedicated recognitional demonstratives are concerned, they are attested at least in a number of Australian languages (Himmelmann 1996: 231–233). In the present volume such a form is attested in Kalamang, a Papuan (West Bomberai) language, as mentioned in §4.2.

Ridge (chapter 4) describes a dedicated contrastive demonstrative in Vatlongos, an Oceanic language. Contrastive uses of demonstratives are also discussed by Meira & Terrill (2005). Treis (2020: 351) suggests that the presence of a dedicated contrastive demonstrative in a language is cross-linguistically rare, but cites examples from the Omotic language Gamo and the Cushitic language Alaaba, as well as the latter's close relative Kambaata, which is also discussed in the present volume.[5]

Besides demonstratives dedicated to non-deictic functions, there are other types of forms and paradigms which can make it difficult to decide how the class of demonstratives should be delimited and defined in a given language, let alone cross-linguistically. In some languages spatial deictics interact with different form classes that encode other types of functions. In this volume, this is the case particularly in Pilagá (Payne & Vidal, chapter 7), where demonstrative roots with a core deictic meaning interact with classifiers in complex ways. In many cases, this involves the encoding of posture and spatial orientation of referents (e.g. as upright, vertical, non-extended), a function not generally associated with demonstrative systems.

As mentioned in §4.1, in Blackfoot, demonstratives can take the proximate/obviative inflection also found on nouns (Bliss & Wiltschko, chapter 6), and this

[5]The Nama demonstrative *náú*, described in Anderson & Keenan (1985: 286) as distal yet "only used for contrastive purposes", seems another likely candidate.

distinction has functions related to salience and noteworthiness of the narrated event. It is the combination of the demonstrative form and proximate/obviative distinction that performs this discourse function, and one might thus debate to what extent this function can be attributed to demonstratives as such.

5 Overview of chapters

The chapters in this volume cover a broad range of languages from across the world, and a range of source constructions and discourse functions. The demonstratives described here belong to systems of very different degrees of complexity (see the morphologically highly complex systems in the Indigenous languages of the Americas, as described by Bliss & Wiltschko and Payne & Vidal), to different morphosyntactic types (see e.g. Diessel & Breunesse) and ontological types (see the discourse functions of manner demonstratives in König, Teptiuk, and Nikitina & Treis). In many languages it is observed that demonstratives of different deictic specifications take diverging paths and develop clearly distinct discourse functions (see König, Ridge, Nahkola et al., Teptiuk). Several of the studies also point out that the syntactic restrictions on individual forms contribute to shaping their extension into the domain of discourse.

König looks at how one can analyse discourse functions of demonstratives which go beyond the established distinction between endophoric and exophoric uses, by investigating which aspect of the core meaning of the demonstrative is lost when its usage is extended: the deictic component, the ontological component, or both. The chapter focuses on demonstratives of manner, quality and degree, which have received relatively little attention in the literature.

Nikitina & Treis examine how manner demonstratives are used in discourse in the African languages Kambaata (Cushitic) and Wan (Mande). They show that, while the core uses of manner demonstratives in these two unrelated languages are strikingly similar, their extended uses differ significantly. The authors attribute these differences to the fact that manner demonstratives belong to different syntactic categories in the two languages.

Ridge discusses the demonstrative system in the Oceanic language Vatlongos. In the spatial domain, Vatlongos makes a three-way distinction between speaker-proximal, addressee-proximal, and distal demonstratives. However, this three-way distinction does not carry over to the use of demonstratives in discourse; here, the language shows a two-way distinction between a speaker-proximal and a contrastive form. Ridge surveys the discourse uses of these two forms, and proposes that the asymmetry between the broad range of discourse functions

found with the proximal clitic *ak* and the restricted uses of contrastive *-e* can be partly accounted for by the differences in their syntactic distribution.

Visser describes the functions of the demonstrative *opa* in the West Bomberai language Kalamang. This form does not encode any deictic distinctions and can only be used adnominally. Visser considers *opa* to indicate the cognitive accessibility of a referent, either via previous mention or in a recognitional sense, by indicating that the addressee has engaged with the referent in real life outside the discourse. The form *opa* is homophonous with a temporal adverb meaning 'just now, earlier', a pattern which is also found in some other languages of Indonesia. Visser suggests a possible grammaticalisation path from adverb to demonstrative, based on the fact that recent events are accessible to the minds of those who have witnessed them.

Bliss & Wiltschko examine a set of forms which they label "untranslatable demonstratives" in Blackfoot, which involve no clear nominal referent and do not make any truth-conditional contribution to the content of the utterance. They show that the untranslatable demonstratives are involved in a number of discourse functions, such as marking a proposition as expected or familiar versus unexpected or new, marking events as salient and noteworthy, and, in combination with vowel lengthening, indicating the speaker's emotive attitude or personal reaction towards the content of the utterance.

Payne & Vidal describe the demonstrative system in the Guaykuruan language Pilagá, which combines demonstrative roots with classifiers and gender markers in a complex system of determiners. The classifiers and demonstratives can have temporal or modal as well as spatial interpretations. Moreover, the 'vertically extended' classifier has been grammaticalised into a clausal subordinator, whereas the demonstrative *m?e*, which can contrast with the proximal and distal forms to indicate medial distance, but which frequently seems to be distance-neutral, also functions as a relativiser. This seems to be linked to an association of *m?e* with information assumed by the speaker to be already activated for the addressee, in contrast to the recognitional demonstrative *naqae*, which functions as an instruction to activate identifiable information.

The study by Fuchs & Schumacher looks at the use of two types of demonstratives in German – *der/die/das* vs. *dieser/diese/dieses* – and compares these to each other and to personal pronouns in terms of the referents they typically refer to anaphorically. The results of an experimental task show that the referential shift potential of different forms appears to be modulated by the interpretive preference of the pronouns. It is not the case that demonstrative pronouns always initiate a referential shift, while personal pronouns maintain the previ-

ously established prominence ranking. Rather, when the personal pronoun is interpreted as referring to the less prominent character, it can initiate a referential shift in favour of this less prominent character. The results moreover show different referential dynamics for these forms: Demonstrative *dieser* appears to shift prominence to a referent only briefly, whereas demonstrative *der* seems to be associated with continuing high prominence of a previously less prominent referent.

Johannessen looks at the use of third person pronouns as demonstratives in Norwegian in expressions like *han læreren* (3sg.m teacher.def.m) 'that teacher'. These have been argued to have a recognitional use, introducing referents as "discourse new and hearer old". Johannessen, however, shows that such an analysis cannot account for the majority of cases in her data, as such forms regularly occur in noun phrases with discourse-active referents. Instead, she argues that they are used to indicate psychological distance, defined as either a lack of familiarity with the referent, or a negative attitude towards the referent.

Nahkola, Reile, Taremaa & Pajusalu compare the use of demonstrative adverbs in Russian, Estonian and Finnish in the description and comparison of locations in an experimental setting. They find parallels in the functions of proximal vs. distal forms, but also differences in terms of which formal class of morphemes (demonstrative pronouns, demonstrative adverbs, personal pronouns, etc.) is used for which function. The authors suggest that the differences between the languages may at least to some extent go back to the differences in paradigmatic structure and the syntactic potential of the forms available in each language.

Teptiuk looks at how manner deictics are used in quotative indexes in computer-mediated communication in five Finno-Ugric languages: Finnish, Estonian, Hungarian, Udmurt and Komi. The languages differ in the number of manner deictics and in the semantic contrasts made in the system, as well as in which of the forms are found in quotative indexes. Teptiuk shows that the patterns of use of manner deictics as quotative indexes depend on their uses outside the quotative domain, and suggests that parallels can be found in languages outside the Finno-Ugric family.

Finally, Diessel & Breunesse look at how demonstratives grammaticalise into clause linkers cross-linguistically. Based on a sample of 100 languages, they look in detail at the types of constructions involving demonstratives from which each type of linker can be shown (or be hypothesized) to have grammaticalized. They emphasise the fact that the grammaticalisation of clause linkers is influenced by the syntactic properties of demonstratives in particular constructions. Moreover,

the authors make the point that not all demonstrative clause linkers are immediately derived from anaphoric demonstratives and discourse deictics: The various types of demonstrative clause linkers are historically related to each other, and these relationships are crucial for understanding the occurrence of demonstratives in certain clause-linkage constructions.

References

Acton, Eric K. & Christopher Potts. 2014. That straight talk: Sarah Palin and the sociolinguistics of demonstratives. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 18(21). 3–31.

Anderson, Stephen R. & Edward L. Keenan. 1985. Deixis. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and grammatical description*, vol. 3: *Grammatical categories and the lexicon*, 259–308. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bril, Isabelle (ed.). 2010. *Clause linking and clause hierarchy: Syntax and pragmatics.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Burenhult, Niclas. 2003. Attention, accessibility, and the addressee: The case of the Jahai demonstrative *ton*. *Pragmatics* 13(3). 363–379.

Burridge, Kate & Margaret Florey. 2002. *Yeah-no he's a good kid*: A discourse analysis of *yeah-no* in Australian English. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 22(2). 149–171.

Dawuda, Carmen. 2009. *Discourse functions of demonstratives and place adverbs with exophoric reference in Logea, an Oceanic language of Papua New Guinea.* Melbourne: Monash University. (PhD dissertation).

Degand, Liesbeth & Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenbergen. 2011. Introduction: Grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification of discourse markers. *Linguistics* 49(2). 287–294.

Diessel, Holger. 1999. *Demonstratives: Form, function, and grammaticalization.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Diessel, Holger. 2006. Demonstratives, joint attention, and the emergence of grammar. *Cognitive Linguistics* 17(4). 463–489.

Dixon, R. M. W. 2003. Demonstratives: A cross-linguistic typology. *Studies in Language* 27(1). 61–112.

Dostie, Gaétane. 2009. Discourse markers and regional variation in French: A lexico-semantic approach. In Kate Beeching, Nigel Armstrong & Françoise Gadet (eds.), *Sociolinguistic variation in contemporary French*, 201–214. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Enfield, Nick. 2003. Demonstratives in space and interaction: Data from Lao speakers and implications for semantic analysis. *Language* 79(1). 82–117.

Englebretson, Robert. 2007. Stancetaking in discourse: An introduction. In Robert Englebretson (ed.), *Stancetaking in discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction*, 1–25. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Evans, Nicholas, Henrik Bergqvist & Lila San Roque. 2018a. The grammar of engagement I: Framework and initial exemplification. *Language and Cognition* 10(1). 110–140.

Evans, Nicholas, Henrik Bergqvist & Lila San Roque. 2018b. The grammar of engagement II: Typology and diachrony. *Language and Cognition* 10(1). 141–170.

Farr, Cynthia J. & Carl R. Whitehead. 1981. This, that, and the other: A study of Korafe demonstratives. *Language and Linguistics in Melanesia* 13(1–2). 64–80.

Fraser, Bruce. 2006. Towards a theory of discourse markers. In Kerstin Fischer (ed.), *Approaches to discourse particles*, 189–204. Oxford: Elsevier.

Grenoble, Lenore A. & Matthew Riley. 1996. The role of deictics in discourse coherence: French *voici/voilà* and Russian *vot/von*. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25. 819–838.

Hanks, William F. 1990. *Referential practice: Language and lived space among the Maya*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Hanks, William F. 1992. The indexical ground of deictic reference. In Alessandro Duranti & Charles Goodwin (eds.), *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*, 43–76. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hanks, William F. 2005. Explorations in the deictic field. *Current Anthropology* 46(2). 191–220.

Hanks, William F. 2009. Fieldwork on deixis. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41(1). 10–24.

Hansen, Maj-Britt Mosegaard. 2006. A dynamic polysemy approach to the lexical semantics of discourse markers (with an exemplary analysis of French *toujours*). In Kerstin Fischer (ed.), *Approaches to discourse particles*, 21–42. Oxford: Elsevier.

Heine, Bernd. 2013. On discourse markers: Grammaticalization, pragmaticalization, or something else? *Linguistics* 51(6). 1205–1247.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus. 1996. Demonstratives in narrative discourse: A taxonomy of universal uses. In Barbara A. Fox (ed.), *Studies in anaphora*, 205–254. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus. 1997. *Deiktikon, Artikel, Nominalphrase. Zur Emergenz syntaktischer Struktur*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

König, Ekkehard. 1991. *The meaning of focus particles: A comparative perspective*. London: Routledge.

König, Ekkehard. 2012. Le rôle des déictiques de manière dans le cadre d'une typologie de la déixis. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 107(1). 11–42.

Küntay, Aylin C. & Aslı Özyürek. 2006. Learning to use demonstratives in conversation: What do language specific strategies in Turkish reveal? *Journal of Child Language* 33(2). 303–320.

Lakoff, Robin. 1974. Remarks on *this* and *that*. In Michael W. LaGaly, Robert A. Fox & Anthony Bruck (eds.), *Papers from the Tenth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 345–356. Chicago, IL: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Levinson, Stephen C. 2018. Introduction: Demonstratives: Patterns in diversity. In Stephen Levinson, Sarah Cutfield, Michael J. Dunn, N. J. Enfield & Sérgio Meira (eds.), *Demonstratives in cross-linguistic perspective*, 1–42. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lichtenberk, Frantisek. 1996. Patterns of anaphora in To'aba'ita narrative discourse. In Barbara A. Fox (ed.), *Studies in anaphora*, 379–412. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Margetts, Anna. 2015. Person shift at narrative peak. *Language* 91(4). 755–805.

Margetts, Anna. 2016. Addressee-based demonstratives as topic markers. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Australian Linguistics Society, Monash University, Melbourne, December 7–9, 2016.

Margetts, Anna. 2019. Demonstratives in topic-related functions. Paper presented at the 11th Conference of Oceanic Linguistics, Nouméa, New Caledonia, October 7–11, 2019. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mp3SOhZ-wVk.

Margetts, Anna. 2020. Different sources, same path: The development of addressee based deictics to markers of discourse status. In Keith Allan (ed.), *Dynamics of language changes: Looking within and across languages*, 1–19. Singapore: Springer Nature.

Mazzon, Gabriella. 2019. Variation in the expression of stance across varieties of English. *World Englishes* 38(4). 593–605.

Meira, Sérgio & Angela Terrill. 2005. Contrasting contrastive demonstratives in Tiriyó and Lavukaleve. *Linguistics* 43(6). 1131–1152.

Özyürek, Aslı. 1998. An analysis of the basic meaning of Turkish demonstratives in face-to-face conversational interaction. In Serge Santi, Isabelle Guaïtella, Christian Cavé & Gabrielle Konopczynski (eds.), *Oralité et gestualité : Communication multimodale, interaction*, 609–614. Paris: Harmattan.

Potts, Christopher & Florian Schwarz. 2010. Affective *this*. *Linguistic Issues in Language Technology* 3(5). 1–30.

Pryor, John. 1990. Deixis and participant tracking in Botin. *Language and Linguistics in Melanesia* 21(1–2). 1–29.

Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schiffrin, Deborah. 2006. Discourse marker research and theory: Revisiting *and*. In Kerstin Fischer (ed.), *Approaches to discourse particles*, 315–338. Oxford: Elsevier.

Šimík, Radek. 2016. On pragmatic demonstratives: The case of pragmatic discourse anaphora in Czech. In Nadine Bade, Polina Berezovskaya & Anthea Schöller (eds.), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung*, vol. 20, 640–657.

Treis, Yvonne. 2020. Presentatives in Kambaata from a Cushitic perspective. In Isabelle Leblic & Lameen Souag (eds.), *Du terrain à la théorie : Les 40 ans du LACITO. Actes du colloque international, 15–17 novembre 2016, Villejuif (France)*, 343–369. Villejuif: LACITO Publications.